

### SECTION III—REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2005. Claims 14 and 23 are amended herein, and claims 14-25 remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement, allegedly because the claims contain subject matter that is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the limitation “suspending the conveyance over the active surface” as recited in claims 14 and 23 is not consistent with what is described in the specification and drawings. According to the Examiner, “suspending” means to hang up or hang so as to be free on all sides except at the point of support. Further, the Examiner says that to “hang” is defined as to fasten to some elevated point without support from below.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections. Claim 14, as amended, recites a process combination for forming a micro electromechanical (MEMS) package including providing a semiconductor device including an active surface, providing a conveyance with at least one embedded MEMS device disposed therein, and “supporting the conveyance over the active surface using a plurality of electrical contacts in a contact array, wherein the at least one embedded MEMS device communicates electrically to the

semiconductor device via at least one of the contacts in the contact array.” The specification clearly supports the limitation of “supporting the conveyance over the active surface using a plurality of electrical contacts in a contact array.” For example, Figures 1a, 1b and 2a and their associated text between page 8, line 8 and page 9, line 14 clearly show and describe an embodiment in which a MEMS 22 and a conveyance 28 are supported over an active surface 14 by an array of electrical contacts 18. The limitation “supporting the conveyance over the active surface using a plurality of electrical contacts in a contact array” therefore is both supported and described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claim 23, as amended, recites a process combination including providing a semiconductor device, accommodating a detached micro electromechanical structure (MEMS) device upon the semiconductor device, “supporting a conveyance over the active surface using a plurality of electrical contacts in a contact array, wherein the conveyance surrounds the detached MEMS device and the detached MEMS device communicates electrically to the semiconductor device via at least one of the contacts in the contact array,” and contacting encapsulation material with at least one of the semiconductor device, the detached MEMS device, and the conveyance to form an integrated MEMS package. By analogy to the discussion above for claim 14, Applicants submit that the limitation “supporting the conveyance over the active surface using a plurality of electrical contacts in a contact array” therefore is both supported and described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at

the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the limitation “suspending the conveyance over the active surface” as recited in claims 14 and 23 is indefinite because “suspending” implies hanging and the conveyance does not appear to hang over the active device.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections. In view of the claim amendments, the discussion in the specification relating to the amended claims and the discussion above, Applicants submit that claims 14 and 23 are now definite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 292-8600.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10-13-05

Todd M. Becker  
Todd M. Becker  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 43,487

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030  
Phone: 206-292-8600  
Facsimile: 206-292-8606

Enclosures: Postcard  
Amendment transmittal, in duplicate